

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 24, 25, and 28 were examined. The claims have been amended as noted above. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Claim 25 was objected to for lacking sufficient antecedent basis. Claim 24 has now been amended to overcome the objection.

All claims are rejected as either being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,267,862 to Parker (hereinafter Parker) or obvious over the combination of Parker and U.S. Patent No. 5,645,420 to Bergersen (hereinafter Bergersen). Such rejections are overcome as follows.

Independent Claim 24, from which all pending dependent claims depend, is now amended to recite that the at least one protrusion comprises a continuous protrusion disposed along said edge which is configured to fit in the undercut of a plurality of teeth (Fig. 15B, and [0058]) and to contact the plurality of teeth along the length of the gingival margin and interdental areas between said teeth (Fig. 14 A-B, Fig. 15 A-B, and [0015]). Support for this amendment can be found as noted above, thus no new matter has been added.

Neither Bergersen nor Parker describe these limitations.

Parker does not describe the limitations of having the protrusion configured to fit in the undercut of a tooth and configured to contact a plurality of teeth along the length of the gingival margin. The projection 60 of Parker is intended to contact only a couple of teeth and at a point "between the gum and the height of contour of a tooth" as described at col. 3, lines 41 to 44 and seen in Fig 10. As seen in the cross-section of Fig. 9, the projection does not extend along the gingival margin. Thus, the projection 60 of Parker neither engages the undercut of a tooth nor extends along the gingival margin. The projection is located in contact with the contour of a tooth as seen in Fig 10. of Parker. As recited by Parker, "Note that the height of contour 65 of each tooth lies occlusal to both projections 60 and 62 so that the walls of the appliance must be flexed outward in order to place or remove the appliance which provides the gripping force." (Col. 8, Ln. 66 - Col. 9, Ln. 2).

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, Applicants believe that Claim 24, as amended, clearly distinguishes the teachings of Parker and Bergersen. For that reason, Applicants believe that all remaining claims, which all depend on Claim 24, are in condition for allowance and request that the Application be passed to issue at an early date.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

James M. Heslin
Reg. No. 29,541

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
JMH:djc/jke
61175336 v1